



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and abusive language which caused a severe nervous shock to plaintiff and which she alleges resulted in a nervous disease, damages are not recoverable, as such an injury is not the natural and probable consequence of defendant's act. *Braun v. Craven*, 175 Ill. 401, 51 N. E. 657, 42 L. R. A. 199.

DISCOVERY—DISCOVERY AND INSPECTION OF BURIED HUMAN BODY.—In an action to recover damages for the death of one Danahy, who is alleged to have died from injuries received in a collision with defendant's automobile, defendant prays discovery of the body of Danahy to ascertain the cause of his death. Code Civ. Proc., § 803, provides that a court of record has power to compel a party to an action pending therein to produce for inspection any article or property in his possession or under his control relating to the merits of the action or of the defense. *Held*, that the application should be denied. *Danahy v. Kellogg* (1910), 126 N. Y. Supp. 444.

In equity the general rule is that a bill will lie by either party to an action at law to have a discovery of matter material to the claim or defense. *Reynolds v. Burgess Co.*, 71 N. H. 332, 51 Atl. 1075, 93 Am. St. Rep. 535, 57 L. R. A. 949; *Wilson v. Miller*, 104 Va. 446, 51 S. E. 837. In many states statutes have been passed regulating discovery. Some of these acts expressly provide that a bill in equity for discovery shall in no way be affected thereby. *Mahone v. Central Bank*, 17 Ga. 111. In case the statute does not so provide, it is held that they do not take away the jurisdiction of the court of equity. *Nixon v. Lumber Co.*, 150 Ala. 602, 607, 43 South. 805, 9 L. R. A. (N. S.) 1255; *Post v. Toledo etc. Co.*, 144 Mass. 341, 13 N. E. 540, 59 Am. Rep. 86. Contra. *Cleveland v. Burnham*, 60 Wis. 16, 17 N. W. 126; *Turnbull v. Crick*, 63 Minn. 91, 65 N. W. 135. In other states statutes expressly abolish bills of discovery. *Baylis v. Bullock Mfg. Co.*, 59 App. Div. 576, 69 N. Y. Supp. 693. As to what may be the subject matter of discovery, the general rule is that one may have discovery of matter material to the claim or defense. *Wilson v. Miller*, supra. In *Reynolds v. Burgess*, supra, discovery was had of broken machinery. Facts resting in the knowledge of the defendant, books, papers or copies thereof in his possession may also be the subject of discovery. *Little v. Cooper*, 10 N. J. Eq. 273; *Utah Const. Co. v. Mont. R. Co.*, 145 Fed. 981. The authorities are in conflict on the question of the power of the court to order a physical examination of a party before trial. By the weight of authority the court may make such an order. *Miami Co. v. Baily*, 37 Ohio St. 104; *Wanek v. Winona*, 78 Minn. 98, 80 N. W. 851, 46 L. R. A. 448. Contra. *Joliet Ry. Co. v. Call*, 143 Ill. 177, 32 N. E. 389; *Stack v. N. Y. Ry. Co.*, 177 Mass. 155, 83 Am. Rep. 269, 52 L. R. A. 328. The question in the principal case, whether a human body is a proper subject matter for discovery, came before the United States Circuit Court in *Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Greisa*, 156 Fed. 308, and the court in that case ordered the body to be exhumed for examination.

EVIDENCE—PRESUMPTIONS—LAW OF ANOTHER STATE.—Plaintiff sued defendant to receive the value of his services rendered in the capacity of a physician and surgeon. He did not state in his complaint where the services were rendered. Defendant demurred for the failure of the complaint to